DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 112 511 EA 007 551

AUTHOR	Wheeler, A. C. R.
TITLE	Administrative Factors in Educational Planning. The Fundamentals of Educational Planning: Lecture-Discussion Series No. 23.
INSTITUTION	United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, Paris (France). International Inst. for Educational Planning.
REPORT NO	IIEP-TM-23-67
PUB DATE	67
NOTE	19p.
AVAILABLE FROM	IIEP Publications, 7-9 rue Eugene-Delacroix, 75016 Paris, France ($0.25, distribution charges)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Comparative Education; *Educational Administration; *Educational Planning; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation; *Organizational Theories; Political Influences; Public Opinion

ABSTRACT

Planning is a complex activity that varies a great deal from country to country depending on such variables as the administrative structure of the country. The complexity of the task is increased because the five planning activities--issuing directives for planning, preparing plans, approving plans, implementing plans, and evaluating and revising plans--overlap each other. Educational planning poses specific administrative problems in three areas--determining the location of a planning agency in a governmental structure, sorting out the relationship between politics and administration, and resolving the issue of involving public opinion in planning. (Author/IRT)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED112511

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Unesco: IIEP
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

The Fundamentals of Educational Planning : Lecture - Discussion Series

No. 23 ADMINISTRATIVE FACTORS IN EDUCATIONAL PLANNING

by A.C.R. Wheeler

EA 007 551

Unesco : International Institute for Educational Planning

1967
IIEP/TM/23/67
$0.25

INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL PLANNING
7, rue Eugène Delacroix
Paris 16e, France

ADMINISTRATIVE FACTORS IN EDUCATIONAL PLANNING

by

A.C.R. Wheeler

This lecture is part of "Fundamentals of Educational Planning; Lecture-Discussion Series" a controlled experiment undertaken by the International Institute for Educational Planning in collaboration with a limited number of organizations and individuals aiming at the development of efficient teaching materials in the field of educational planning. By their very nature these materials, which draw upon tape recordings, transcriptions and summary notes of seminars, lectures and discussions, conducted by IIEP as part of its training and research programme, are informal and not subject to the type of editing customary for published documents. They are therefore not to be considered as "official publications".

The opinions expressed in this lecture are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the views of the Institute.

The use, adaptation or reproduction, in whole or in part of these materials is limited to institutions and persons specifically authorized by IIEP.

3

SUGGESTED METHOD FOR THE USE OF THE PRESENT INSTRUCTIONAL UNIT

Instructional Unit IIEP/TM/23/67 is composed of

I. Present document containing a transcription of the lecture entitled "Administrative Factors in Educational Planning" by A.C.R. Wheeler and suggested additional reading (see list of Contents overleaf)

II. Tape (recording of the lecture)

IT IS SUGGESTED THAT STUDENTS READ THE TEXT CAREFULLY BEFORE LISTENING TO THE TAPE.

CONTENTS

PART I	THE DIVISION OF ACTIVITIES IN AN EDUCATIONAL PLANNING PROCESS	1
	INTRODUCTION	1
	The Nature of Planning	1
	The Educational Planning Process	2
	The Issue of Directives for Planning	2
	The Preparation of Plans	3
	The Approval of Plans	4
	The Implementation of Plans	5
	Evaluation and Revision of Plans	6
	Conclusions	6
PART II	THREE SPECIFIC ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS IN EDUCATIONAL PLANNING	8
	INTRODUCTION	8
	A. The Location of Planning Agencies	8
	B. The Relations between Planning, Administration and Politics	10
	1. Structural Problems	11
	2. Operating Problems	11
	C. The Role of Public Opinion in Planning	12
	SUGGESTED ADDITIONAL READING	14

PART I THE DIVISION OF ACTIVITIES IN AN EDUCATIONAL PLANNING PROCESS

INTRODUCTION

This is the first of two lectures. In this one my main intention is to set out an approach to educational planning as it interests somebody like myself, who is very much concerned with organizational problems and changes. I shall not try to go too much into detail about specific administrative problems in planning, although hopefully some of these will begin to become clear. I shall, in fact, reserve detailed consideration of some of the more complex administrative problems for the second lecture.

I want to begin by setting up an "Aunt Sally" and knocking it down.

When I first became interested in educational planning a few years ago, I was not then specifically interested in administrative problems, I was more concerned with model-building. So, I then thought of planning, in the first place, as an activity of a few very highly qualified experts, functioning in a rather abstract way, probably in a very high and remote position, close to the Minister of Education, far removed from everybody else in the educational system, who did a lot of very technical exercises and produced a sophisticated document, which hardly anybody else could understand, had this approved by some higher authority and then their work was finished. The country had educational planning. I have now, perhaps, gone to rather the opposite extreme and consider this a terribly narrow way of looking at educational planning. To me educational planning is a far broader activity than this obviously exaggeratedly narrow concept.

The Nature of Planning

I would ask you, first of all, to think what is the ultimate purpose of educational planning. This sounds very philosophical and I do not want to be philosophical, but I want to start from this rather remote point. I suggest that, if somebody asked you this, you would have to end up by saying something like: the purpose of educational planning is to advance educational improvements, whether they are quantitative or qualitative, as rapidly as possible and as cheaply as possible, to benefit individuals, to benefit the nation, etc. When you say something like that, you have to recongize straight away that you are speaking of planning as a technique of operation, and I would suggest that you can also derive from this several of the distinguishing characteristics of planning: it looks ahead; it tries to foresee the future (in fact it tries to guide the future); it endeavours to ensure that subsequent behaviour will be rigorous in terms of achieving the maximum possible from a variety of alternatives with any given resources (and when I say resources, I think in human as well as material terms).

Here, you can immediately see that, in approaching planning like this, we are very much concerned with the success of planning. How can we ensure that planning is successful, or is more successful than it has been? In connexion with that, as soon as you mention success, the next question is obviously: What counts

as success? I would say, in the light of the earlier remarks, that success could be regarded as the achievement of specified targets by specified means (and I emphasize by specified means).

This obviously brings us to a consideration of a whole process of action within which the technique of planning is being applied. So we come around to deal with what, in the Institute here, we have come to call the "planning process", and I should like to talk this afternoon about this planning process, because it seems to me that all the administrative problems have to be situated within this context.

The Educational Planning Process

It has often been said that the planning process can be divided into a series of stages. Personally, I do not like the term "stages" and instead I shall use the term "activities". I shall tell you why I choose to play with words like this, as it may appear. As soon as you talk about stages in anything - stages of growth, etc. - you obviously start thinking in temporal terms as a question of how quickly one stage succeeds another. I think myself that the planning process is a relatively complex one, and to try to say that the different stages succeed each other is very much of an oversimplification. Instead, I think that most of the stages are, to a large extent, simultaneous. This is why I prefer to call them activities, because I think it is then less confusing.

In discussing this planning process in more detail, I am going to talk as if we were discussing planning at the national level. But I think you would find that the type of analysis involved could be applied to planning at all levels - regional planning, local planning - and perhaps even the planning of the development of a particular school.

Therefore, in discussing the planning process I want to consider with you the various activities involved, in the first place, and secondly, the types of people who participate in these activities. I would list five main activities for consideration: the first of these, I call the "issuing of directives for planning"; the second one, I call, the "preparation of plans"; the third one, is the "approval of plans"; the fourth, the "implementation of plans"; and, fifth, "evaluation and revision". I want to discuss each of these five, with special emphasis on the personnel aspect: who are the people concerned in this particular activity? But in discussing each of these activities separately, I want to emphasize very strongly that I am not trying to separate these activities, but simply to distinguish them so that we can then go on to see how these different activities link up with each other and influence each other throughout the planning process.

The Issue of Directives for Planning

Let us turn to the first of the activities I mentioned, which I call the "issuing of directives". Fairly obviously, since education is a close personal concern of almost anybody in a society, it is going to be very important for the planners to try to act in accordance with opinions and this involves that there

should be some way that these opinions can be relayed to the planners. In the simplest example, the Minister of Education, as a politician, has to be susceptible to opinions within society and can act as a means of relaying some general directives to the planners which will guide their work in formulating a plan. Obviously that is one possibility, but with a little reflection you can see there might be several other equally possible ones. For example, in another country it might be the case that it was not so much the Minister of Education who issued directives like this, but it could, for example, be the Central Planning Commission. In yet another country it might be that these directives would come mainly from a certain political party, or again of course (and perhaps this is most likely) all of these people - all of these sources - will be giving directives to the planners of education as to what they should do in preparing the plan. But further than this, and to make it more complicated still, the planners are not only the recipients of such formal directives from higher authorities, but it is also quite possible that they may be subject to political influences of various degrees, the activities of various pressure groups, etc. So that, in fact, the problem of the directives which the planners receive to aid them in formulating the plan can be quite complex, depending on the country concerned.

The Preparation of Plans

Given that the planners have received some guides as to what they should put into the plan, the next activity which I want to discuss is the actual one of "plan preparation". I think the study of educational planning in general was at first most concentrated on this activity. In the first place there is a question of who might be involved in preparing the plan. Obviously anything I say here may well apply to one country, but definitely would not apply to another. Almost every country has its own distinct arrangements in relation to the structure of authorities for planning. But let us say as a generalization, which is subject to correction in individual cases, that the preparation of an educational plan is probably entrusted to a small group of technicians. In current circumstances they may be more or less trained to do the task.

Next, there is the question of the position of these people in the hierarchy of the Ministry of Education. They may be directly linked to the Minister himself. They may be, again depending on the structure of the Ministry, on the administrative side of the Ministry, or, as is the case in some countries, they may be closely linked to the Chief Inspector of Education. But in all of these cases a very apposite question in the preparation of the plan is the nature of their relations with the other personnel in the Ministry. However, this is only one level of this question of personnel relations. Depending on the structure of planning organs in the country, there is also the question of their contacts with the central planners. Another important aspect here is the question of the extent to which the Ministry of Education controls education within the country. It is very often the case that certain types of education are taken care of by other ministries. I am thinking particularly that some kinds of vocational education might be with the Ministry of Labour, the Ministry of Health or the Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Industry, etc., in which case the scope of educational planning may be more limited, and such vocational education may be left out of consideration by the Ministry of Education.

Again the range of duties of the officials charged with preparing the plan will also partly depend on the nature of the other units within the Ministry of Education. An obvious example here: Is there a specific Statistics Unit? If there is not, then clearly a large part of the work of the planners will be in the gathering of statistics, the processing, etc.

The Approval of Plans

Given the preparation of a draft plan, the next activity to which I want to refer is the question of "approval of a plan". This, I think, has been a relatively ignored activity in previous studies. The first question is: who is going to approve a draft plan? Is it the Ministry of Education? Is it the Planning Commission? Is it the Cabinet? Is it the legislature? Several factors will influence the answer to this question. In the first place, the extent to which educational planning is integrated with other types of planning is obviously very important here. If educational planning takes place independently, then it is more likely that the Ministry of Education will be responsible for approving plans. However, if educational planning is closely integrated into other types of planning, then the Planning Commission will obviously be very much concerned with this question of approval.

Another factor which I would suggest is very significant here is the nature of the political system. In some countries the legislature is a relatively weak body. Political life may be relatively undeveloped outside one ruling party or a dictator. In this case, the government approval of the plan can go a long way to ensuring that action will be taken to implement it. But in another country it may be the case, and I would suggest to you that if it were ever the case that the United States wanted to make a federal plan for education, it would be the case that a very important body would be the legislature the Congress. The legislature is relatively strong in the government system there. In which case the process of approving the plan would be a rather different one from a country with a more dictatorial or Cabinet type of government.

A third factor which will have an influence on the method of approving the plan is the form of approval, the status of the plan once approved. In some countries you find that the plan is given the status of a law. In other countries it is somewhat less formal. It is a directive of some kind, but it may not be given statutory authority. In another country the plan may be kept as a rather secret document. This question of the form which the plan takes when approved, I think, is probably very influential on the nature and the extent of the activity of approval.

It is probably the case that the first formulation of the plan may go no further than the Minister of Education, who may send it back to the planners to reformulate; it goes back to the Minister; it receives some discussion in the Planning Commission, and so there is this back-and-forth procedure and successive drafts. Hence you can see from this that the activity of approval may be very complex, and rather long drawn out. It may also be influenced by the content of the plan at this stage; as to how detailed the plan has to be as it comes out of

the planning unit, and how technical it has to be. The degree of technicality may well be influenced in turn by the competence of the people who have to approve the plan. It is obviously very unlikely that it is much use submitting a document full of demonstrations of econometric technique to a political assembly, because very few of them would have much understanding of it. Therefore, I would suggest that this activity of the approval of educational plans, which in the past has tended to be taken for granted, is in fact very important and very complex.

The Implementation of Plans

Given the approval of the plan, we come to the fourth of the activities that I want to talk about, which is that of the "implementation of plans". It is said very frequently nowadays that every country has a plan, or something like one, but hardly any country is able to implement its plan. So it begins to appear that it is very crucial to consider in much more detail what is involved in this activity of plan implementation. Once again, the first question I would ask is: who is responsible for the implementation of the plan? I think it is relatively unlikely in a country of any size that the small group of officials who prepared the plan have a great deal to do with carrying out in detail the proposals contained within it. Hence, one of the problems here becomes the question of the structure of the Ministry of Education and the extent to which the planners are integrated into the rest of the Ministry.

That only keeps this question within the Ministry of Education. There are other ministries which are very much involved. Very obviously the Ministry of Finance, or whoever is responsible for paying out the money that must be spent in implementing the plan, has an extremely close interest in implementation. Secondly, I should suggest that in many countries the Ministry responsible for local authorities will be very much concerned in this problem of implementing educational plans, since in many countries it is the case that education is the major activity, in terms of expenditure, of local authorities.

Another very crucial factor which will help to determine the involvement of the planners (by which I mean the people who prepared the plan) with its implementation, will be the extent to which the plan is detailed in its formulation. It is obviously the case that, in a country the size of India or Brazil, a national educational plan cannot go into detail down to the level of individual local authorities, or individual schools. It has to be a blueprint for provincial action which in turn will be more detailed in relation to these specific projects. It may even be the case, therefore, that the size of the country helps to determine the involvement of the planners in the implementation of their plans.

Also, we can see that in a larger country it begins to be true that what is called the implementation of the plan at one level of government in fact becomes the preparation of the plan at a lower level of government, since the lower level receives more general directives which comprise the national plan, and it in turn, at the lower level, has to interpret these, derive detailed proposals from them and carry these out. So, the planning process here becomes

a multiple level one, and if we already have the impression that the planning process is complex, it is very obvious that it is much more complex in the activity of implementation, particularly in a large country.

Evaluation and Revision of Plans

Very closely tied up with implementation is the last of the five activities I mentioned, that of "evaluating and revising the plan". This also has been relatively neglected hitherto, perhaps this is because many countries are still only beginning to undertake planning, and they may not even have reached this final phase yet, or they may be too preoccupied still with the manifest imperfections of their activities at earlier stages.

Obviously, the evaluation of the plan requires some sort of feed-back mechanism from the lowest levels of the administration, in order that those at the top may know what goes on below them. Hence, a great many people are involved in this activity of evaluation. But the final approval or disapproval of progress being made has to be at a fairly high level in the administrative hierarchy. I suggest, therefore, that the national planners, or people of a similar level, must be very much involved in this evaluation task. However there is a good question here as to whether it should be the planners themselves who should be evaluating the plan, or whether there should be some other group of people for this. You might say, on the one hand, the planners should not have the task of evaluating their own work. To the extent that there may have been mistakes in the plan, this is perhaps the right thing to say. But on the other hand it may be some extraneous influences, such as lack of financial resources which had been anticipated, which have caused the plan not to be fulfilled, and which in turn have produced the need to revise the plan. So, I do not think it is easy to say that it should be the planners who evaluate, or it should not be the planners who evaluate. I think that they will have to be involved in this, but perhaps they should not be the only people concerned in it.

Another problem in this activity of evaluation is the revision of the plan, and here I would suggest that the way in which the plan is set out when it is approved may be a factor to consider. If the plan has been formulated as a law then it may be relatively difficult to amend a law. However, if the plan is simply an internal document it may be much easier to amend it.

Conclusions

In talking briefly about each of these five activities which I have suggested comprise the planning process, you notice that we constantly refer to the way in which the character of one activity may influence what goes on in another activity. Thus, I would suggest to you that the planning process is in practice quite a complex concept. It will vary a great deal from country to country depending on such variables as the administrative structure which I have mentioned in passing. In particular the various activities will greatly overlap with each other in time. In fact, it may even be the case, I think, that something could be going on under

each of these five headings at the same time. May be that is a slight exaggeration, but I think it is certainly closer to the truth than saying that each of these activities will follow one another. What I would suggest to you is that each of the five activities I have mentioned, in the order that I have mentioned them to you, must be successive insofar as each of them must begin after the one before but the first activity does not have to stop before the second one can begin. Each of the activities in the process must begin after the one before, but it is by no means possible to say when each one will stop. Thus, I would think that once a country has adopted planning and has gone on to its second and third plans, it is quite conceivable that all of these activities will be going on at the same time. The evaluation of the last plan may well be taking place at the same time as the preparation of the next plan, for example, and somewhere within this you will be having directives for the next plan, and similarly some of the first steps for approval of the next plan may already have been begun. Similarly, again, some of the winding up of the implementation of the last plan may still be taking place.

PART II THREE SPECIFIC ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS IN EDUCATIONAL PLANNING

INTRODUCTION

Three subjects are discussed in this lecture. The first of these is the question of the possible locations of a planning agency within a government structure and some of the advantages and disadvantages of different locations. Secondly, we consider a rather untidy subject, to which we give the heading "Planning, Administration and Politics". Here, we discuss particularly relations between planners and other government administrative personnel and some of the difficulties of administration in developing countries. This is a vast subject and all we can hope to do is to introduce some of the questions and issues that are being raised in this area. Finally we devote some time to discussing the pro's and con's of involving public opinion in planning.

A. The Location of Planning Agencies

In turning to the first of these subjects, the position of planning agencies in the government structure, we must emphasize that it is not primarily the educational planning agency that we want to talk about - rather the economic planning agency. We shall try to show how the location of the economic planning agency and the extent of its powers has potentially a large impact on educational planning and for that matter on all other types of sectoral planning.

If you made an inventory of the structure of government in different countries, and the location of the planning agencies, you would probably find that nearly every country has its own individual solution.

Thus, in discussing this subject, we have to approach it in rather general terms. We would need a series of lectures on this subject alone if we were going to discuss all the possible variations of structure that have been tried. Instead we discuss only a few of the main alternatives which have been most commonly chosen by different countries.

It is immediately possible to discern several important influences on the location of the planning agency. In the first place, the degree of government commitment to planning will help to determine where the planning agency is placed, and secondly, the type of planning which is envisaged. Specifically, this allows us to differentiate between what has been called the indicative type of planning such as France practises and the type of planning which is characteristic of the Eastern European countries, and all the variations in between.

Four possible basic alternatives for the location of the economic planning agency can be suggested:

1. Attachment to the office of the Chief Executive, usually the Prime Minister or the President.

2. The economic planning agency can be within the Ministry of Finance
3. A specific Ministry of Planning
4. Inclusion of planning within the portfolio of another ministry, for example, in one or two countries planning was included in the Foreign Affairs Ministry. In fact planning has, at some time or another, been put under almost every other ministry.

1. Returning to the first alternative mentioned - the association of economic planning with the Chief Executive - the experience of different countries that have tried this alternative is that this is probably the best location for an economic planning agency. But, there is one very important reservation to be made. This only works if the Chief Executive is himself actively interested in planning and wants to foster it. Given this very important condition, then the planners who are working in close co-operation with the Chief Executive have the authority that they need within the rest of the government structure. However, it is obvious that this can be perhaps only a temporary solution. For example, if one Prime Minister supports planning, well and good, but if his successor is not interested in planning, then the authority of the planners probably declines.

2. The second alternative mentioned was location in the Ministry of Finance. This is fairly complex to discuss since there are obvious advantages in having the economic planners located thus, but also there are serious disadvantages.

Thus, the Ministry of Finance and the economic planners are both very much interested in economic affairs, and hence they have to be in close contact with each other. However, when looked at more closely, it is clear that this basic common interest conceals important divergences. For example, the Ministry of Finance has as a primary concern the government budget whereas the economic planners are more concerned with the whole economy, meaning in most countries mainly the private sector. Therefore, there begins to be a possible divergence of interests.

But, a more basic problem is the difference of attitude between these two authorities. The Ministry of Finance, basically, is an agency which has to conserve government's resources. On the other hand, planners have, as a primary task, that of expending national resources in aid of expansion. Here there might potentially be a psychological split between these two groups of personnel. Thus in some countries which have tried to combine the economic planners with the Ministry of Finance, the Ministry personnel became very divided, e.g. in Sudan.

A further problem about locating the economic planners in the Ministry of Finance is that the job of the Minister of Finance is one of the most exacting of any Minister in the first place. So, if he is given all the additional responsibilities of economic planning, it can become very difficult for one man to adequately exercise all these duties. Thus, while it sounds a good idea to put economic planning in the Ministry of Finance, in practice there have been found to be quite serious disadvantages to this solution. But what must be said, in any case, whether or not the economic planning agency is found in this location, is that one of the closest linkages the economic planners must have is that with the Ministry of Finance.

3. The third alternative I mentioned was that of establishing a separate Planning Ministry. Many countries have done this, though not always calling it a planning ministry. A Ministry of Economic Development is a very common alternative title. This has the possible advantage that it can concentrate expertise very easily in one ministry which is totally concerned with planning, and if the minister who is in charge is an advocate of planning, a potentially dynamic organization may be created. The difficulty with this solution is that a new ministry is introduced into a structure of existing ministries. Because of the nature of planning, this means that a ministry which is only of equivalent authority has, in some way, to control or oversee the other ministries. This, in turn, possibly creates a great deal of resentment among operating ministries, such as the Ministry of Education. There have been well-documented instances where, following the establishment of a planning ministry, former practices were maintained and the authority of the planners was circumvented by operating ministries going directly to the Ministry of Finance to obtain funds, etc. This suggests that, unless the planning Ministry is given some special authority that raises it above the other Ministries, in practice it is relatively difficult for it to operate as it should.

4. The last alternative mentioned was that of including planning within another ministry. The arguments just advanced against a separate planning ministry obviously apply even more strongly in this case, which suggests that this is not a good alternative.

To sum up: these thoughts suggest that the two former choices - locating the economic planners with the Chief Executive, or else, with the Ministry of Finance - tend to have more advantages on their side than the others.

For our purposes the important question arising from these ideas is as to how the location of the economic planners affects the educational planning agency? The degree of authority of the economic planners within the government structure, is likely (to put it no stronger) to be related to the amount of authority of the educational planners within the Ministry of Education. This suggests the potential existence of an opposition between the educational planners and the rest of the Ministry of Education. Hopefully, this is not the case but in practice it appears often to have been so. Therefore, the stronger the economic planners the more they can possibly re-inforce the educational planners in their own ministry. However, this is a very tentative statement. It is open to much more detailed discussion in relation to specific cases.

B. <u>The Relations between Planning, Administration and Politics</u>

This immediately leads us to the next subject, the question of relations between planning, administration and politics and the attitudes of the other parties to planning.

The basic problem here is that planning has sometimes become characterized as some kind of specific expertise which is isolated from other government functions. Thus many of the publications of planners are quite technical in appearance as compared with other government publications. So, the idea has grown up that planners have some special expertise which other administrators do not possess.

A partial answer to this is that the planners should try, when preparing a plan, to involve in this task of preparation as many as possible of the interested parties and specifically, all those people in the government service who are going to have any part in implementing the plan. Thus, this suggests that the basic approach should not be one of the isolation of the planners from other personnel. On the contrary, the planners should endeavour - through consultations, meetings, etc. - to encourage the contributions of their colleagues in the administration with a view to obtaining their active support of the proposals incorporated in the plan. However, like all brief statements, this is a counsel of perfection. In practice, it ignores the many serious operational problems, faced by administrations in developing countries, which we go on to discuss next.

1. Structural Problems. Every country is developing at some level or other, and, if we look back in its history to the period when government was being established, we generally find that the original tasks of government were maintenance of law and order and the collection of taxes. An enquiry as to the date of foundation of different ministries, would probably show that the first to be established were those of Justice and Finance. However, in recent years, as it has become the policy of governments to concern themselves with the development of the societies they govern, this has required both great expansion of the tasks of government and a change in their character. Governments are no longer trying to maintain the status quo, instead they are trying to change it in specific directions. This has, obviously, had its impact on the administration. At its simplest, it has meant a need for more administrative personnel and for new competences, which has placed great strains on administrations.

Among such problems of structure must be mentioned the tendency in many countries for politicians to influence the recruitment of civil servants and their promotion. Secondly, the administrative structure is not at all suited to the task that it now has to undertake. It is commonly the case that there are more people than are needed at the lowest level (too many messengers, too many clerks), but not enough top administrators, at least not well-trained ones. More particularly, it is often very difficult to find people who can fit in the middle-level posts of an administration, as assistants to the top administrators. Even when well-qualified personnel are available, it is very often the case that their qualifications are not used to advantage and there is seldom any extra payment given to people with special qualifications. Conversely, this provides little encouragement to others to acquire such qualifications. Where there are detailed regulations for administrative conduct, they tend to be one of the most difficult aspects to change. Such rigidity allows an inefficient administrator, once he has a position, to be fairly safe in it.

2. Operating Problems. The procedures of administration are often extremely cumbersome. When any action has to be taken a great many forms have to be filled out and then countersigned by different people. The amount of paper work involved is out of proportion to any result that can be expected. In any case, before action can be undertaken, everybody who might be involved has to be consulted. Thus files circulate up and down the administrative hierarchy for a long time before a decision is finally taken.

The last point mentioned was the problem of files having to go to too many people before any action was taken on a matter. The next point may perhaps sound contradictory, but it is that there is very commonly a lack of co-ordination. There is no co-ordination between the people who should be in co-ordination, between different ministries or between a ministry and its regional and local administration. The type of consultation which does take place, through circulation and minuting of files, is no substitute for such co-ordination.

While, obviously, all of these problems desirably should be solved, they are really reflections of a more basic problem. This is the problem of attitudes, the problem of making the people involved more dynamic, making them want to overcome the problems, want to act, want to produce progress. This is the basic problem which educational planners will have to face: the problem of revising attitudes both among the people they work with and among the people they are trying to benefit.

C. The Role of Public Opinion in Planning

It is quite frequently said, almost as a truism, that the public must be involved in planning. But, one seldom hears much more on the subject. Why is this? It can be considered from two viewpoints; the involvement of the public in the preparation of plans, and secondly, their involvement in the implementation.

As mentioned earlier, it is very desirable that all those actively involved in implementing a plan should be brought into its preparation. It is also desirable that all those people with an interest in the matter to be planned be involved in the preparation of plans. The planners should invite their co-operation and encourage their understanding of the objectives of the plan. In the case of educational planning, such people would be the representatives of private education, Teachers' Unions, parents, perhaps some politicians who are especially interested in education, and may be even some of the older students.

Desirably, such people should be invited to contribute their ideas for the content of the plan and then discussions should be held in order that they should see how the planners can or cannot make use of these ideas. However, saying this is not to imply that the Teachers' Unions, Parents' Associations, etc., should be making the plan. It is essential that the government remains the final authority. Thus, in such a process of consultation, the Minister of Education at some point will have to set out the authority of the planners and his backing of them, while simultaneously specifying the interest of the government in having public co-operation in its policies, both to try to do what the public wants and also to ensure that the public sees the need for what the government proposes.

This aspect of the involvement of public opinion in planning has been relatively ignored. Generally when people talk about involving public opinion they have in mind some kind of appeal to the mass of the population to support the plan. It is not immediately obvious what this means. In the case of education, a great many of the people are going to be affected by the actions carried out under the plan, whether as parents or students, or administrators. What meaning

can then be attached to the concept of supporting the plan? Does it mean asking people not to obstruct proposals disagreeable to them? Such a demand begs many political questions.

How are people to be involved in a plan with regard to its implementation? Examples can be drawn from two countries which have made specific efforts in this direction. In India (which perhaps has had more experience of planning than most countries) the Ministry of Information has for the last ten years published a journal which is specifically intended to publicize planning. It does not only express official viewpoints since articles highly critical of Indian planning are sometimes published. What proportion of the population is reached by this? When you notice that the journal is published only in English and Hindi, which are only two of the many languages spoken in India (though obviously two of the most important) and then look at the nature of the articles, it is clear that somebody who has never studied economics would have difficulty in following much of the contents. Therefore, it seems that this can only reach a relatively small proportion of the people.

The other country referred to is Kenya which went to the length of writing a small report about the plan which was entitled "African Socialism and its Application to Planning in Kenya". But again, this was a relatively sophisticated document and its purchase price quite high in relation to most African incomes. It appears that such efforts cannot reach very many of the people, especially where there is a large proportion of illiterates in the population.

These types of efforts are designed primarily to influence the opinion leaders among the community. It is only the more educated who can understand and appreciate such journals and publications. This still leaves the largely uneducated urban or rural mass of the population uninvolved.

Mass media are the only way of communicating with people on this scale, and radio suggests itself as the best for this purpose. Here again, to communicate with people in the village, it is essential to talk about what concerns them; to show how the plan is going to affect their lives. It is no use talking about how the plan is going to raise national income because national income does not mean anything to them.

Suggested Additional Reading

Beeby, C.E. Planning and the Educational Administrator, Paris, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization/International Institute for Educational Planning, 1967.

Gross, B.M. (ed) Action under Planning, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Gross, B.M. The Administration of Economic Development Planning: Principles and Fallacies, New York, United Nations, 1966 (ST/TAO series, M/32).

Hanson, A.H. The Process of Planning: A Study of India's Five-Year Plans, 1950-1964, London, Oxford University Press, 1966.

Waterston, A. Development Planning: Lessons of Experience, Baltimore, Johns Hopkins, 1965.

Wheeler, A.C.R. The Organization of Educational Planning in Nigeria, Paris, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization/ International Institute for Educational Planning, 1968.